So Few Reds Left J. Edgar Hoover Stops Counting Them; Was Moscow Booby-Trapped Over the Arctic? P. 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VI, NO. 18 MAY 12, 1958 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Web of Official Falsehood on Nuclear Matters Begins to Unravel

How Strauss Misled the President as Well as the Public

The President has been forced by Senator Anderson to make a striking admission the full significance of which has yet to be appreciated. At his last press conference, in answer to charges made by the Senator, Mr. Eisenhower admitted that only 40 percent of the current nuclear testing series has to do with the development of so-called cleaner weapons. It had been assumed, ever since Dr. Edward Teller and Admiral Strauss made their dramatic appearance at the White House last June with the sensational story that a clean bomb was possible if only testing were allowed to continue, that this was the principal purpose of our tests. Over and over again we have been told by Dr. Teller that we were testing in order to develop a clean bomb so we could protect "the innocent bystander." Now it turns out, according to the President's own figures, that 60 percent of the current test series has nothing to do with the problem of a clean bomb, i.e. of reducing radioactive fallout.

The Hedging Begins

This, however, is not the whole story. The President as well as the public seems to have been misinformed by the AEC Chairman as the reader can easily see for himself in the adjoining box. Three days after Mr. Eisenhower told the press Admiral Strauss of the AEC had informed him "at least 40 percent of the tests have their principal purpose to get cleaner bombs," the Admiral began to back down. In his own letter of May 3 to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, Admiral Strauss disclosed that the 40 percent figure he gave the President was only arrived at by deducting from the total number of the current tests those which have to do with "the effect of explosions upon military structures and materials." It is only 40 percent of the remainder which has to do with cleaner bombs. Just how many tests are concerned with "the effect of explosions upon military structures and materials" was not revealed, so it is impossible to tell *just what that 40 percent is 40 percent of.* It might easily prove to be only 20 percent of the total number of tests, perhaps more, perhaps less.

Why the Weasel Wording

Admiral Strauss made another revision in the wording he gave the President. While the President said Admiral Strauss told him "at least 40 percent . . . have their principal purpose to get cleaner bombs," the Admiral's letter to the Joint Committee phrased it differently. There the Admiral, in replying to Senator Anderson's charges, said "some 40 percent . . . are related directly *or indirectly*" (italics added) to the development of cleaner weapons. There may well be, as Senator Anderson told the Senate two days later in a full dress reply to the AEC Chairman, a "vast difference" between the statement as passed on by the President and the statement as revised by the Admiral.

The reason Admiral Strauss had to word his reply to the Joint Committee carefully is that the Joint Committee has access to AEC records and can check for itself, as Senator Anderson suggested be done in his Senate speech last Monday. The Joint Committee was established by law as the Congressional watchdog of the AEC. The net effect of the Strauss letter was to revise downward the estimate he gave the President. Obviously considerably less than 40 percent of the total number of current tests have to do directly with the making of a cleaner bomb.

Only Half the Story

This is only one half the story now slowly coming to light of official prevarication about nuclear weapons and their testing. If the reader will turn to the new admissions, contra-

(*Continued on Page Four*)

Smoking Out the Truth At Last

Forty Percent—But of What?

". . . The number of clean bomb tests will be relatively small. . . ."

—Sen. Anderson, Meet the Press, April 27.

"I was told by the Chairman of the AEC that at least 40 percent of the tests have their principal purpose to get cleaner bombs."

—Pres. Eisenhower, to the press, April 30.

"There will also be a number of detonations to observe the effect of explosions upon military structures and materials. Excepting this latter category which, strictly speaking, is not for weapons development, some 40 percent of the tests are related directly or indirectly to the development of weapons with greatly reduced fallout—that is to say, to so-called clean weapons."

—Admiral Strauss, Letter to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, May 3.

"On the clean bomb question, which the AEC implied was the main purpose of our current tests, I do not believe the Commission is supported by the facts. . . . Of course, the United States wants to develop clean bombs, but their use may be sometimes limited. Our current tests do not have them, in any great degree, as their primary purpose. . . . There is a vast difference between the phrase [used by Strauss] 'directly or indirectly' and the phrase [used by the President] 'their principal purpose'."

—Anderson, speaking in the Senate, May 5.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The State Dept. Would Be Relieved if Moscow Turned Wooden Indian Again

Did the Russians Fall for A Diplomatic Booby-Trap in the Bomber Affair?

I am inclined to believe that in the episode of the bombers and Arctic inspection the Soviets fell for a clever trap, a publicity story by the Strategic Air Command. There is no evidence that these bombers go anywhere near the Soviet Union. There is evidence that as many as possible are gotten off the ground as a precautionary move whenever any "blips" on far radar screens indicate an attack by plane or missile is possible. The SAC's fear is to have its planes caught on the ground and destroyed by surprise attack, as in the Philippines when the Japanese struck.

Too Hasty Improvisation

Having improvised a sudden move on the basis of that United Press story, Moscow did not handle itself at all cleverly or wisely. It had no information beyond the UP story to follow up with, and it soon put itself in an impossible position. Suppose the Security Council had ordered the U.S. to stop those flights, would this not necessitate some system of inspection? And some assurance to the U.S. that there was no danger of attack? Was Moscow really foolish enough to believe a one-sided system could be set up?

The Russians insisted that they do not want to discuss such matters except at the summit. But they cannot expect to have everything their own way. Wasn't the U.S. resolution, as modified by the Swedish, an opening for intelligent diplomacy? It would have passed the question to the summit but after preliminary study by a committee of experts. What harm is there in having some discussion beforehand of the technical problems involved? Wouldn't a summit meeting be more fruitful if preliminary reports were available? If the Russians didn't like Arctic inspection, they could have offered an amendment or counter suggestion of their own. They might, for example, have linked Arctic inspection with the Rapacki plan, which calls for inspection of Germany and Central Europe. Here they would have put the onus of rigidity on Mr. Dulles.

In any case, the polar regions are likely to be a key area militarily, the shortest avenue of attack between U.S. and U.S.S.R. Wouldn't it be worth discussing the question among all the countries which have territory in the Arctic regions? The Russians have indicated they are willing to discuss measures to prevent surprise attack at the summit. All the UN resolution asked of them was some preparatory work on the Arctic. I believe that old wooden Indian streak that marked Russian diplomacy under Stalin and Molotov is making its reappearance, along with such other evidences of renewed Stalinism as the current attack on the Yugoslavs for refusing to follow every jot and tittle of party line. There are circles in State Dept. and Pentagon which would be immensely relieved if only Moscow settled back into an inflexible line.

U. S. Reds So Few For the First Time in Years the FBI Chief Stops Counting Them

Even Lenin Never Kept A Stiffer Upper Lip Than J. Edgar Hoover

A feature of J. Edgar Hoover's appearance each year before the House Appropriations Committee is his annual report on Communist party members. Last year he gave the membership as 17,360, a drop of 14 percent. This year, for the first time in many years, Mr. Hoover gave no figure on party membership. Perhaps he knew it would be so small as to be ludicrous.

Instead of giving a figure, Mr. Hoover made a remark whose faith in the potency of a die-hard handful could be matched only in Moscow. "I cannot emphasize too strongly," he told the Appropriations Commitee, "that the numerical strength of the Communist party means nothing." Even Lenin never kept a stiffer upper lip.

Three Times as Many G-Men

The ratio of G-men to Communists is rising sharply. The new FBI budget calls for 14,025 jobs. The number of Communist party members today is probably below 5,000—and not a few of these are themselves G-men.

Mr. Hoover nevertheless in bullish. Just around the corner, he sees the Communists creating "the most devastating fifth column the world has ever known." Already its influence "reaches into almost every walk of life." It would be interesting to know what Mr. Hoover includes in that "almost." The FBI even now has "approximately 150 known or suspected Communist front and Communist infiltrated organizations under investigation." (Last year he testified the House Un-American Activities alone had listed 628 "such Communist front organizations." Are the other 478 going unwatched? Or have they disappeared in the last 12 months?)

The rousing success Mr. Hoover claims to have found on the Left he blames on the courts. "Crimes and subversion have become critical challenges," he told the committee, "due to the mounting success of criminal and subversive elements in employing loopholes, technicalities and delays in the law to defeat the interests of justice."

In Mr. Hoover's vocabulary, the Bill of Rights and the due process clause seem to figure, if at all, only as "loopholes" and those who are concerned with them seem always to be put down as "pseudo-liberals." He was bitter about "certain organizations" which "hypocritically bar Communists from their membership, but seek to discredit all persons who abhor Communists and communism. They claim to be anti-Communist but they launch attacks against Congressional legislation designed to curb Communism."

It is instructive to compare this with Mr. Hoover's calm testimony on another menace—that of racism. Here he said nothing which could offend any white supremacist. "The Negro situation," he said was "being exploited" by the Communists. They are trying "to infiltrate Negro mass organizations . . . not to aid the Negroes but . . . to take advantage of all controversial issues on the racial question." Eastland wouldn't have said it differently.

Never A Word Against Racism

Racism today is the real menace to internal security. Why does Mr. Hoover never warn against the peddlers of prejudice, or the divisive effects of those who preach race hatred? Mr. Hoover told the committee he wanted to stress the fact that "our investigative policies in civil rights matters are governed entirely by orders issued by the Department" and are conducted "in a thorough, factual and impartial manner." He was saying as plainly as he could that the civil rights work was something imposed on the FBI.

One civil rights matter in which Mr. Hoover could exercise great influence is that of police brutality against Negroes. This seems to make up the bulk of civil rights complaints. He said the FBI handled 1,289 civil rights cases during the fiscal year 1957 and that this included "1,062 cases involving 1,921 law enforcement officers." Of these 1,062 cases, he said, "1,003 had been closed and 59 remained pending." Only one officer was convicted and only 12 were under indictment. Remarkably few complaints against police officers seemed to stand up under FBI investigation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Smoking Out the Truth at Last: More Evidence of Official Prevarication

We Are Interested in Developing Dirtier Bombs Than Ever

"They [the military] are not only supporting them [dirtier bombs] but they have pulled bombs out of stockpile and inserted something which makes it dirtier."

—Senator Anderson, Meet the Press, April 27.

"Now, no military officer that I know of has ever even suggested that we have dirtier bombs, certainly there has been no official suggestion of that kind."

—Pres. Eisenhower, replying at press conference, April 30.

"Sometime in the past, we did some studies—strictly paperwork—on this business of increasing the amount of fissionable material and making them dirtier. It's possible that somebody is still looking into this. But we are neither developing nor stockpiling these weapons."

—Defense Dept. spokesman, Washington Post, April 30.

"The facts are that atomic bombs are only taken from stockpile for purposes of routine inspection or for modification or improvement. No material is 'inserted' in bombs for the purpose of increasing the amount of fission products or to add to the total fallout."

—Admiral Strauss, replying to Anderson, May 3.

MR. WILLIAM H. LAWRENCE (*New York Times*). Were bombs made dirtier in the process of re-examination or whatever it is you do to a bomb?

ADMIRAL STRAUSS. Well, I don't know what you mean by making them dirtier. If you mean whether the total fallout was increased, the total world-wide fallout was increased by something that was done to the bombs, the answer is no.

—Strauss Interview, Face the Nation, May 4.

"Let me ask the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission to state whether or not the local fallout would be increased. I am familiar with the testimony to which he refers. It was given by a most eminent scientist. It appears on page 54 of the minutes [of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy] of January 21, which are labelled 'Top Secret' all over. . . .

"If the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission can use that statement to say that the total world-wide fallout was not increased by something done to the bomb, and say then the answer is 'No,' he should also introduce the rest of Dr. York's statement that related to the subject as to whether it might become dirtier locally. . . .

Dr. Libby, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission . . . made a statement at Amherst College April 30. . . . Dr. Libby said: 'I think there is absolutely no doubt that [local] fallout from surface-planted nuclear weapons . . . is one of the two great threats of nuclear war. . . . It is estimated an attack on this country could well cause millions of deaths in this way unless we have adequate defense plans for local fallout, which at present we do not have.' . . .

"Apparently Dr. Libby does not regard local fallout to be beneficial to the people on whom it is falling. . . .I also suggest the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission knows it just as well as I do. The clever use of his words to the press, and his adding of a phrase and putting in the words 'world-wide fallout' show he not only knew it, but retained a very good recollection of it."

—Anderson replying in the U. S. Senate, May 5.

MR. [Nat S.] FINNEY (*Buffalo Evening News*). Admiral Strauss, could the crux of this be in certain sections of the new Effects of Nuclear Weapons handbook in which it is stated that for some time consideration has been given to the possibility of using radioactive material deliberately as a weapon in what is called radiological warfare. . . . To me this adds up almost to a declared intention on the part of the Pentagon and the AEC, which I understand prepared this handbook together, to—if the situation is appropriate—conduct radiological warfare.

ADMIRAL STRAUSS. It is certainly not foreclosed, Mr. Finney. But there is a big difference between let us say weapons that are in stockpile for such a purpose—and I am not saying that they are—and the charge that weapons have been withdrawn from stockpile and something inserted in order to have that effect caused.

MR. FINNEY. You are also, sir, not saying that they are not stockpiled.

ADMIRAL STRAUSS. I am not at all. . .

MR. [George] HERMAN (*CBS News*). Is it possible, feasible, practical and simple, for instance, to take bombs out of the stockpile at some future time if necessary and to render them dirtier by addition or insertion of some new material?

ADMIRAL STRAUSS. These things are possible.

—Admiral Strauss interviewed, Face the Nation, May 4.

"I believe that there are ways that the Congress, if it desires, can check the accuracy of statements I have made today. . . . I believe it would be possible without involving the national security too deeply for the Armed Services Committees of the Congress to ask the military to let them look at the stockpiles records. . . .I think they will reveal that weapons have been drawn from the stockpile, then modified or 'improved,' if the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission prefers that word; and that, if these improvements were to become effective, there might be a change in the amount of fallout—local fallout, not world-wide fallout."

—Anderson replying in the U. S. Senate, May 5.

What the Official Pentagon-AEC Handbook Discloses About Dirtier Bomb Plans

"For some time consideration has been given to the possibility of using radioactive material deliberately as an offensive weapon in what is called 'radiological warfare.' The basic idea is that radioactive contamination of areas, factories, or equipment would make their use impossible or very hazardous without any accompanying material destruction. To be effective, a radiological warfare agent should emit gamma radiations. . . .

"Even if a radioisotype with suitable properties and which could be readily manufactured were selected as a radiological warfare agent, the problems of production, handling and delivery of the weapon emitting intense gamma radiations would not easily be solved. In addition, stockpiling the radioactive material would present a difficulty. Other weapons can be prepared in advance. . . . They can be kept for a long time without suffering deterioration. This is not true for radiological warfare agents, for natural decay would result in a continuous loss of active material. . . .

"The situation has undergone a change with the development of bombs having high fission energy yields. The explosion of such bombs at low altitudes can cause radioactive contamination over large areas that are beyond the range of physical damage. . . . Instead of preparing and stockpiling the contaminating agent in advance, with its attendant difficulties, the radioactive substances are produced by fission at the time of the explosion. Radiological warfare has thus become an automatic extension of the offensive use of nuclear weapons of high yield."

—The Effects of Nuclear Weapons, prepared by the Defense Dept., published by the AEC, July 12, 1957, pages 427-8.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Anderson Charges Strauss With "McCarthyism" in Using Red Smear Innuendoes

Administration Accused of Shifting from "Atoms for Peace" to Atoms for War

(*Continued from Page One*)

dictions, evasions and statements assembled on page three, he will see that the government is actively engaged in the problem of developing dirtier weapons, in using radioactive fallout as a deliberate instrument of so-called radiological warfare. There can be no doubt that the Russians are doing the same. Radioactive poison is the third dimension of nuclear war, the other two being blast and fire.

The Official Handbook Contradicts Ike

Mr. Eisenhower's denial at his last press conference — "no military officer that I know of has ever even suggested that we have dirtier bombs"—is contradicted (as the reader will see) by the official handbook of the Defense Department and the AEC, "The Effects of Nuclear Weapons," released last July 12. When the assembled record is reviewed, it will be seen that Senator Anderson was wrong, if at all, only in charging that bombs were taken out of stockpile to have something "inserted" in them to make them dirtier. It appears, from Admiral Strauss's rejoinder, that bombs *are* taken out of stockpile but only to be "modified" or improved. One effect of the improvements is to give us means, as the official handbook says, to spread "radioactive contamination over large areas that are beyond the range of physical damage." This widespread rain of radioactive poison is called "local fallout" though it may cover many hundreds or thousands of square miles, as distinct from the "world-wide fallout" which descends only gradually over the years from the stratosphere. Whole countries, perhaps whole continents, may be rendered uninhabitable by this means if a new world war comes.

Against this background it was not surprising to learn from Senator Anderson's speech last Monday that the Administration has been dragging its feet on its highly advertised "atoms for peace" program. Legislation needed for cooperation with EURATOM, the joint West European project for atomic power development, has been so long delayed by the AEC that action may not be possible at this session. The Budget Bureau, according to Senator Anderson, "has cut the heart out of" the research and development program advocated by the Gore-Holifield bill for peacetime reactors. Emphasis has shifted to the pending amendments which would authorize the sale or gift of military reactors and non-nuclear components of nuclear weapons to other nations, a do-it-yourself-kit from which they could make themselves nuclear weapons. Anderson said the Administration had shifted from atoms-for-peace. He said he did not expect legislation cooperating with EURATOM "because we are so busy with atoms for war, considering whether the effect of what we do is to supply atomic warheads to Germany. . ." The Senator said that while he favored full exchange of atomic information with Britain, he would fight any moves toward creating new nuclear powers via the pending atomic "give away" legislation.

Prize Remark of the Atomic Age
"I feel very sympathetic to pacifism myself."
—Admiral Strauss, Face the Nation, May 4.

An Old Non-Nuclear Weapon

With rising Congressional opposition to the nuclear "give-away" bill and a growing public clamor for cessation of tests, Admiral Strauss seems to be shifting toward a classic non-nuclear weapon of last resort, the red herring. The man who showed in the Oppenheimer case how deftly he could exploit this tactic, has begun to hint in recent interviews that there is "something organized" and "not open" about the campaign to end nuclear testing. "Nobody, I presume," Anderson told the Senate, "actually was called a tool of Russia, but there was a pretty strong implication if one wanted to look at it." Anderson said Strauss "seeks to become the modern apostle of McCarthyism." We believe the time is past, public anxiety too deep, Strauss himself too vulnerable to offer any hope along those lines. As for operating "in the open," said the *Washington Post* in an editorial last Tuesday on "Strauss' Straw Man," "that is a pretty peculiar observation, coming from the man who presides over what is perhaps the most rigidly secret operation in the country."

Watch Next Week's Issue for Fresh Angles on Dr. Hans Bethe's Testimony and Secrecy About Current Testing

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:
5/12/58

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C.
An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in th U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED